REMARKS

An Office Action has been issued in the subject application in which all of the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness. Reconsideration of the subject application in view of these Remarks is respectfully requested.

Requirements for Obviousness

The Federal Circuit stated in *In re Oeticker* [977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ 2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992)], "[i]f examination at the initial stage does not produce a prima facie case of unpatentability, then without more the applicant is entitled to grant of the patent." The CCPA interpreted prima facie obviousness in *In re Lintner* [458 F.2d 1013, 173 USPQ 560, 562 (C.C.P.A. 1972)] as follows:

> In determining the propriety of the Patent Office case for obviousness in the first instance, it is necessary to ascertain whether or not the reference teachings would appear to be sufficient for one of ordinary skill in the relevant art having the references before him to make the proposed substitution, combination or other modification.

In *In re Rinehart* [531 F.2d 1048, 189 USPQ 143 147 (C.C.P.A. 1976)], the CCPA added that the prima facie case requires that the teachings of the reference "appear to have suggested the *claimed subject matter*." In view of these decisions, a prima facie case of obviousness is established when the Patent Office provides:

a) one or more references
b) that were available to the inventor and
c) that teach
d) a suggestion to combine or modify the references,
e) the combination or modification of which would appear to be sufficient to have made the claimed invention obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

If any one of these elements is not present, the prima facie case of obviousness is not established. In the instant case, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references fail to meet these requirements.